UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND FEE(S) DUE

89713	7590	08/17/2010

Accenture c/o Murabito, Hao & Barned LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
STARKS, WILBERT L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2010

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,188	06/22/2001	Olivia Ruth Burgess	ACNR-P1001-01255-PCT-US	7248

TITLE OF INVENTION: A SIMULATION ENABLED RETAIL MANAGEMENT TUTORIAL SYSTEM

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	NO	$1510	$300	$0	$1810	11/17/2010

**THE APPLICATION IDENTIFIED ABOVE HAS BEEN EXAMINED AND IS ALLOWED FOR ISSUANCE AS A PATENT.
PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS CLOSED.** THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.
THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE OFFICE OR UPON
PETITION BY THE APPLICANT. SEE 37 CFR 1.313 AND MPEP 1308.

THE ISSUE FEE AND PUBLICATION FEE (IF REQUIRED) MUST BE PAID WITHIN **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE
MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR THIS APPLICATION SHALL BE REGARDED AS ABANDONED. **THIS
STATUTORY PERIOD CANNOT BE EXTENDED.** SEE 35 U.S.C. 151. THE ISSUE FEE DUE INDICATED ABOVE DOES
NOT REFLECT A CREDIT FOR ANY PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE IN THIS APPLICATION. IF AN ISSUE FEE HAS
PREVIOUSLY BEEN PAID IN THIS APPLICATION (AS SHOWN ABOVE), THE RETURN OF PART B OF THIS FORM
WILL BE CONSIDERED A REQUEST TO REAPPLY THE PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE TOWARD THE ISSUE FEE NOW
DUE.

HOW TO REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:

I. Review the SMALL ENTITY status shown above.

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as YES, verify your current
SMALL ENTITY status:

A. If the status is the same, pay the TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown
above.

B. If the status above is to be removed, check box 5b on Part B -
Fee(s) Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required)
and twice the amount of the ISSUE FEE shown above, or

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as NO:

A. Pay TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above, or

B. If applicant claimed SMALL ENTITY status before, or is now
claiming SMALL ENTITY status, check box 5a on Part B - Fee(s)
Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required) and 1/2
the ISSUE FEE shown above.

II. PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL, or its equivalent, must be completed and returned to the United States Patent and Trademark Office
(USPTO) with your ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). If you are charging the fee(s) to your deposit account, section "4b"
of Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal should be completed and an extra copy of the form should be submitted. If an equivalent of Part B is filed, a
request to reapply a previously paid issue fee must be clearly made, and delays in processing may occur due to the difficulty in recognizing
the paper as an equivalent of Part B.

III. All communications regarding this application must give the application number. Please direct all communications prior to issuance to
Mail Stop ISSUE FEE unless advised to the contrary.

**IMPORTANT REMINDER: Utility patents issuing on applications filed on or after Dec. 12, 1980 may require payment of
maintenance fees. It is patentee's responsibility to ensure timely payment of maintenance fees when due.**

PTOL-85 (Rev. 08/07) Approved for use through 08/31/2010.

PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL

Complete and send this form, together with applicable fee(s), to: <u>Mail</u> Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
or <u>Fax</u> (571)-273-2885

CURRENT CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (Note: Use Block 1 for any change of address)

```
89713          7590        08/18/2010
```

Accenture c/o Murabito, Hao & Barned LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Note: A certificate of mailing can only be used for domestic mailings of the Fee(s) Transmittal. This certificate cannot be used for any other accompanying papers. Each additional paper, such as an assignment or formal drawing, must have its own certificate of mailing or transmission.

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission
I hereby certify that this Fee(s) Transmittal is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop ISSUE FEE address above, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-2885, on the date indicated below.

_____ (Depositor's name)

_____ (Signature)

_____ (Date)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,188	06/22/2001	Olivia Ruth Burgess	ACNR-P1001-01255-PCT-US	7248

TITLE OF INVENTION: A SIMULATION ENABLED RETAIL MANAGEMENT TUTORIAL SYSTEM

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	NO	$1510	$300	$0	$1810	11/17/2010

EXAMINER	ART UNIT	CLASS-SUBCLASS
STARKS, WILBERT L	2129	706-045000

1. Change of correspondence address or indication of "Fee Address" (37 CFR 1.363).

☐ Change of correspondence address (or Change of Correspondence Address form PTO/SB/122) attached.

☐ "Fee Address" indication (or "Fee Address" Indication form PTO/SB/47; Rev 03-02 or more recent) attached. **Use of a Customer Number is required.**

2. For printing on the patent front page, list

(1) the names of up to 3 registered patent attorneys or agents OR, alternatively,

(2) the name of a single firm (having as a member a registered attorney or agent) and the names of up to 2 registered patent attorneys or agents. If no name is listed, no name will be printed.

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

3. ASSIGNEE NAME AND RESIDENCE DATA TO BE PRINTED ON THE PATENT (print or type)

PLEASE NOTE: Unless an assignee is identified below, no assignee data will appear on the patent. If an assignee is identified below, the document has been filed for recordation as set forth in 37 CFR 3.11. Completion of this form is NOT a substitute for filing an assignment.

(A) NAME OF ASSIGNEE

(B) RESIDENCE: (CITY and STATE OR COUNTRY)

Please check the appropriate assignee category or categories (will not be printed on the patent) : ☐ Individual ☐ Corporation or other private group entity ☐ Government

4a. The following fee(s) are submitted:
☐ Issue Fee
☐ Publication Fee (No small entity discount permitted)
☐ Advance Order - # of Copies _____

4b. Payment of Fee(s): (Please first reapply any previously paid issue fee shown above)
☐ A check is enclosed.
☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.
☐ The Director is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s), any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number _____ (enclose an extra copy of this form).

5. Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)
☐ a. Applicant claims SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27.
☐ b. Applicant is no longer claiming SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27(g)(2).

NOTE: The Issue Fee and Publication Fee (if required) will not be accepted from anyone other than the applicant; a registered attorney or agent; or the assignee or other party in interest as shown by the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Authorized Signature _____   Date _____

Typed or printed name _____   Registration No. _____

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,188	06/22/2001	Olivia Ruth Burgess	ACNR-P1001-01255-PCT-US	7248

			EXAMINER

89713   7590   08/17/2010

Accenture c/o Murabito, Hao & Barned LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

STARKS, WILBERT L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2010

Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154 (b)
(application filed on or after May 29, 2000)

The Patent Term Adjustment to date is 1754 day(s). If the issue fee is paid on the date that is three months after the mailing date of this notice and the patent issues on the Tuesday before the date that is 28 weeks (six and a half months) after the mailing date of this notice, the Patent Term Adjustment will be 1754 day(s).

If a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) was filed in the above-identified application, the filing date that determines Patent Term Adjustment is the filing date of the most recent CPA.

Applicant will be able to obtain more detailed information by accessing the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) WEB site (http://pair.uspto.gov).

Any questions regarding the Patent Term Extension or Adjustment determination should be directed to the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (571)-272-7702. Questions relating to issue and publication fee payments should be directed to the Customer Service Center of the Office of Patent Publication at 1-(888)-786-0101 or (571)-272-4200.

PTOL-85 (Rev. 08/07) Approved for use through 08/31/2010.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	09/887,188	BURGESS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Wilbert L. Starks, Jr.	2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *Applicant's filing of 07/26/2010*.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *2-9,11-18,20-27,29-35,37-44,46-53,55-62,64-71,73-80 and 82-89*.

3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

      a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None   of the:

           1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

           2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

           3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

     (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

           1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

     (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

     Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

/Wilbert L. Starks, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2129

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, 29-35, 37-44, 46-53, 55-62, 64-71, 73-80, and 82-89 are pending and have been examined.

The claims are deemed statutory because they are claimed to be practiced on a computer.

Reasons for Allowance

Independent claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, 29-35, 37-44, 46-53, 55-62, 64-71, 73-80, and 82-89 are allowed.

The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, 29-35, 37-44, 46-53, 55-62, 64-71, 73-80, and 82-89 are considered allowable since when reading the claims in light of the specification, as per MPEP §2111.01, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 2. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "indexing" of the media information occurs after the claimed "feedback" step.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 3. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "inventory control" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 4. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "pricing strategy" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 5. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "return on revenue" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 6.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of

presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "markdown" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

       Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 7.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of

presenting this data claimed);

     c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

     d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the claimed "stocking" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

     Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 8. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

     a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

     b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "assortment strategy" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

    Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 9. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative of a store goal;

    b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "adjusting an example" step is a simulation based on the un-simulated "student's progress" data toward the store goal.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 11. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

    b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "advertising information" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 12.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "inventory control" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 13. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "pricing strategy" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 14.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "return on revenue" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 15.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the claimed "markdown" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 16. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

     a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

     b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

     c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

     d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the claimed "stocking" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 17.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that receives an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "assortment strategy" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 18.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "retail information" (note that there is no step of

presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "adjusting an example" step is a simulation based on the un-

simulated "student's progress" data toward the store goal.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 20.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

    b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "linking information" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

    Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 21.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "electronic mail" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 22.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

     a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

     b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

     c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

     d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the inclusion of claimed simulated data with the prior claimed measured

data.

     Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 23.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "time-synchronized multimedia" data shows no indication of

being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 24.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a) computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b) after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c) the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d) the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e) the claimed "video conference" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 25.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "emanat[ions] from the Internet" data shows no indication of

being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 26.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "telephony information" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 27.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "chat room information" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 29.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

     a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

     b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

     c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

     d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the claimed "video information" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

     Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 30.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "electronic mail" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 31.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "time synchronized multimedia information" data shows no

indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 32.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

      a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

      b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

      c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

      d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

      e)   the claimed "video conference" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

      Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 33.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "emanation from the Internet" data shows no indication of

being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 34.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "telephone" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 35.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "chat room" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 37.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

     a)   computer executable instructions that receive an indicium representative

of a store goal;

     b)   after receiving the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

     c)   the evaluation of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

     d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

     e)   the claimed "indexing" of the media information occurs after the claimed

"feedback" step.

     Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 38.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

    b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "synchronized media data" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

    Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 39.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "telephone" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 40.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "video" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 41.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

    b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "audio" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

    Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 42.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "dialog" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 43.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "Internet" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 44.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

    a)   computer executable instructions that present (without receiving) an

    indicium representative of a store goal;

    b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the computer

    executable instructions some "information" to motivate accomplishment of the

    goal (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

    c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

    indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

    d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

    accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

    presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

    is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

    state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

    that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

    between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

    "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

    e)   the claimed "text" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

    Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 46.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "indexing" of the media information occurs after the claimed

"feedback" step.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 47.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a) "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b) after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c) the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d) the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e) the claimed "synchronized media" data shows no indication of being

simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 48.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a) "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b) after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c) the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d) the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e) the claimed "telephone" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 49.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a
store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some
"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in
accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the
presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"
is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of
state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further
that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference
between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be
"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "video" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,
discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 50.
Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;
dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed
limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a
store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "audio" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 51.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "dialog" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 52. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "Internet" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

        Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 53.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"retail information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "text" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 55.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "linking" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 56.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 57. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorting of "objects" shows no indication of being simulated.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 58. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

   a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

   b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

   that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

   c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

   indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

   d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

   accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

   presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

   is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

   state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

   that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

   between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

   "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 59.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

   a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorted "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 60.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in
accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the
presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"
is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of
state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further
that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference
between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be
"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,
discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 61.
Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;
dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed
limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note
that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 62.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   presenting (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating some "information" (note

that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "achievement" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 64.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "link" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 65.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 66.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some

"information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorted "object" data shows no indication of being simulated
data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,
discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 67.
Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;
dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed
limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a
store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some
"information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in
accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the
presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"
is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of
state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further
that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference
between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be
"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 68. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorted "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 69. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 70.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 71.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that presents (without receiving) an indicium representative of a

store goal;

b)   after presenting the claimed indicium, integrating into the "logic" some "

information" (note that there is no step of presenting this data claimed);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "achievement" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 73.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "linking" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 74.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "explanation" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 75.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "explanation" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 76.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal ... wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "video clip" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 77.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorted "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 78.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no

indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 79.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a

store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated

presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in
accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the
presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"
is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of
state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further
that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference
between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be
"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,
discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 80.
Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;
dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed
limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   computer executable instructions that receive indicia representative of a
store goal;

b)   after receiving the claimed indicia, integrating into the non-simulated
presentation some "examples" (i.e., simulated data);

c)   the monitoring of the student toward the store goal (note that there is no
indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal … wherein "inventory control" is integrated into the

presentation (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal"

is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of

state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further

that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference

between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it wouldn't be

"feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "context" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 82.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "link" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 83.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "explanation" data shows no indication of being simulated

data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 84.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 85.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

      a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

      b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

      d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

      e)   the claimed "video clip" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

      Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 86.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

      a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job. Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the difference between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed sorted "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 87. Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A; dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal…otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 88.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "feedback" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Further, none of the references of record, whether taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of limitations specified in independent claim 89.

Specifically, the closest prior art is: Bloom et al., (U.S. Patent Number 5,597,312 A;

dated 28 JAN 1997; class 434; subclass 362), which discloses most of the claimed

limitations, but fails to disclose the following combination:

a)   "logic" that "integrates examples" (i.e., simulated data) into the

presentation of non-simulated data;

b)   after integrating into the "logic" some "examples," monitoring the student

toward the store goal (note that there is no indication that this claimed "store

goal" is a simulated store goal);

d)   the provision of store goal "feedback" assisting the student in

accomplishing the goal (note again that there is no indication that this claimed

"store goal" is a simulated store goal. Therefore, the claimed "presentation" is a

dashboard of state information of an actual store as the student trains on the job.

Note further that the claimed "feedback" must include a measurement of the

difference between the actual store state and the store goal...otherwise it

wouldn't be "feedback" in the common sense of the word);

e)   the claimed "context" data shows no indication of being simulated data.

Only to the extent that these features (specifically as defined above) are not found in the prior art of record is the present case allowable over the prior art.

Note also that the claimed invention trains the student on a non-simulated store. Therefore, actual inventories are manipulated during the training process

Conclusion

Any comments considered necessary by Applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Wilbert L. Starks, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3691.

Alternatively, inquiries may be directed to the following:

S. P. E. Donald A. Sparks   **(571) 272-4201**

Official (FAX)   **(571) 273-8300**

/Wilbert L. Starks, Jr./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2129

WLS

01 AUG 2010